This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/470,058	12/22/1999	KIMBERLY JOYCE WELBORN		5713
41212 7	7590 08/09/2004		EXAMINER	
NORMAN K			NOBAHAR, ABDULHAKIM	
P.O. BOX 20111 SAN JOSE, CA 95160			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JUSE, C.	A 95100		2132	
			DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	09/470,058	WELBORN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Abdulhakim Nobahar	2132				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNITIES of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 in In No period for reply is specified above, the maximum state of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months at earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply unication. b) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3) tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH's will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANI	v be timely filed 0) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>20 May 2004</i> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 18-37 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 18,20-22,26,28-31,34 and 35 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 19,23-25,27,32-33,36 and 37 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by	the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F Paper No(s)/Mail Date	· · · /	mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Response to Arguments

- 1. This communication is in response to applicant's Response received on May 20, 2004.
- 2. Claims 1-17 are cancelled.
- 3. Claims 18-34 are newly added and no new matter is introduced.
- 4. In view of new grounds of rejection the claims rejection are as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 21 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2132

Regarding claims 21 and 31, there is no explanation in the specification on the following:

Claim 21: "a second list of e-mail user identifiers is created..."

Claim 31: "the e-mail user identifier is added to a second list..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 18, 22, 26, 30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Venkatraman et al. (6,014,688) (hereinafter Venkatraman).

Regarding claim 18, Venkatraman discloses:

A computer virus avoidance system that sends an e-mail with a mock computer virus to e-mail users (see, for example, column 1, lines 15-19 and column 4, lines 3-7) and creates a first list of e-mail user identifiers of e-mail users who activate the mock computer virus. See, for example, column 5, lines 3-10, column 6, lines 10-15, column 8, lines 1-23, column 8, lines 32-42 and Fig. 15, where collecting and compiling the

Art Unit: 2132

return receipt responses corresponds to the recited "creates a first list of e-mail user identifiers..."

Regarding claim 22, Venkatraman discloses:

The mock computer virus sends e-mail to a preset e-mail address when the mock computer virus is activated (see, for example, column 2, lines 34-37, Fig. 15, 160 and column 8, lines 37-43).

Regarding claim 26, Venkatraman discloses:

E-mail with the mock computer virus is sent to an e-mail user (see, for example, column 1, lines 15-19 and column 4, lines 3-7) and when the e-mail user activates the mock computer virus, the e-mail user identifier is added to a first list. See, for example, column 5, lines 3-10, column 6, lines 10-15, column 8, lines 1-23, column 8, lines 32-42 and Fig. 15, where collecting and compiling the return receipt responses corresponds to the recited "the e-mail user identifier is added to a first list."

Regarding claim 30, Venkatraman discloses:

The mock computer virus sends e-mail to a preset e-mail address when the mock computer virus is activated (see, for example, column 2, lines 34-37, Fig. 15, 160 and column 8, lines 37-43).

Regarding claim 34, Venkatraman discloses:

Art Unit: 2132

An e-mail with the mock computer virus is sent to an e-mail user (see, for example, column 1, lines 15-19 and column 4, lines 3-7) and when the e-mail user activates the mock computer virus, the identifier of the e-mail user is added to the list of e-mail user identifiers of e-mail users that activate a mock computer virus. See, for example, column 5, lines 3-10, column 6, lines 10-15, column 8, lines 1-23, column 8, lines 32-42 and Fig. 15, where collecting and compiling the return receipt responses corresponds to the recited "the identifier of the e-mail user is added to the list..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20, 28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman et al. (6,014,688) (hereinafter Venkatraman) in view of Donoho et al. (6,256,664 131) (hereinafter Donoho).

Regarding claims 20, 28 and 35, Venkatraman does not expressly disclose that an e-mail message is sent to the user who activates the mock computer virus (opens the attachment of an e-mail). Donoho (column 88, lines 13-35) teaches a method of broadcasting advisory messages to a plurality of information consumers. In this method

Art Unit: 2132

the mail reader application located on the consumer computer sends a notifying message to advisory reader upon occurrence of an event corresponding to the recited "open the attachment". The advisory reader evaluates the advisories in an event pool upon receiving the notifying message and sends a relevant message(s) to the mail reader and the mail reader then displays the message(s) to the user who has opened the attachment.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the feature of sending (advisory or warning) message(s) to user who opens an e-mail attachment as taught in Donoho in the system of Venkatraman, because it would provide a mechanism to direct typical piece of information to consumers having a very special combination of circumstances (column 1, lines 33-35).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman et al. (6,014,688) (hereinafter Venkatraman) in view of Fischer (5,390,247).

Regarding claim 29, Venkatraman does not expressly disclose that the e-mail attachment at the recipient computer transmit itself to other e-mail users, if the user activates the attachment (the mock computer virus). Fischer discloses a method for creating a traveling program that is capable of determining at least one next recipient and transmitting itself to that recipient(s) automatically. See, for example, abstract, column 5, lines 37-42 and column 7, lines 46-57.

Art Unit: 2132

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the capability of transmitting itself to other recipients by a computer code as taught in Fischer in the system of Venkatraman, because it would provide a feature for the e-mail attachment to determine at least one next destination or recipient for transmitting itself (column 5, lines 1-7).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 19, 23-25, 27, 32, 33, 36 and 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2132

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Abdulhakim Nobahar whose telephone number is 703-

305-8074. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abdulhakim Nobahar

Page 8

Examiner

Art Unit 2132

AN

August 2, 2004

GILBERTO BARRON

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100